



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/736,229	12/15/2000	David Giroux	11953.0003	8649

7590 01/11/2005

Stuart T. F. Huang
Steptoe & Johnson LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/736,229

Applicant(s)

GIROUX ET AL.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Argument

1. The **Remarks** filed on 10/12/2004 is sufficient to overcome the Yaegashi reference (Patent Number: 6289450) because Authentica is the same assignee of both Yaegashi and the instant application and thereby Yaegashi only qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and not as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130 (b).

Art Unit: 2131

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1 and 26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6289450. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference is the information segment as well as the associated decryption key is encrypted or not. Since the encryption techniques for computer / network security is so well-known, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to encrypt the decryption key at the key server before sending to the client so that the security can be enhanced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claim limitation of claim 17 “the key is never stored in memory at a user location between said receiving and said destroying” is not enabled by the specification. As understood by the examiner, the decryption key is never saved (or stored) at the user location (or user machine) according to the specification – This is different from the claim limitation as addressed above and the encrypted electronic content can never be decrypted otherwise.

7. Any other claims not addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependency. Equivalent rejections apply to the dependent claims 18 – 21.

Art Unit: 2131

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yaegashi (Patent Number: 6499106), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi.

As per claim 5, Yaegashi teaches a method for issuing a key lease, comprising:

receiving, at a remote server, a request to lease a decryption key for an encrypted electronic segment (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 28 – 53);

determining whether a key lease can be issued for the encrypted electronic information based on at least one of a remote server restriction, an information restriction, and a user restriction (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 28 – 53);

creating a voucher in response to a determination that the key lease can be issued, said voucher including at least the decryption key, and at least one

Art Unit: 2131

time limitation associated with the decryption key (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 23 – 53);

encrypting at least the decryption key of the voucher; and sending the voucher to the user location (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 51 – 56);

As per claim 7, Yaegashi teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 5). Yaegashi further teaches at least one time limitation includes an expiration time based on at least one of a maximum allowed by the remote server, a maximum allowed by the information, a maximum allowed by user limitations, and the requested time frame (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 20 – 28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: 6499106), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi.

As per claim 24, Yaegashi teaches a method of limiting access to a segment of encrypted information, comprising:

saving, at a remote server, a decryption key for the segment, the segment being at a location other than the remote server (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 51 – 53);

receiving a request from an authorized user for the decryption key (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 28 – 53);

sending a copy of the decryption key from the remote server to a source of the request (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 51 – 56);

Yaegashi further teaches a key expiration mechanism (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 22 – 26).

Yaegashi does not disclose expressly destroying the decryption key at the remote server in response to the elapse of a predetermined period of time.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify (or to set / configure) the “elapsed time since the last use of the key” with the value of “zero” to accommodate “destroying the key immediately” because this enhances the security assuming the security concern overweighs the cost of additional processing time required when the key is needed again.

As per claim 9, Yaegashi teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 5). Yaegashi further teaches a key expiration mechanism (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 22 – 26).

Yaegashi does not disclose expressly destroying the decryption key at the remote server after a predetermined period of time.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify (or to set / configure) the “elapsed time since the last use of the key” with the value of “zero” to accommodate “destroying the key immediately” because this enhances the security assuming the security concern overweighs the cost of additional processing time required when the key is needed again.

10. Claims 1, 3, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: 6499106), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi, in view of Deng (Patent Number: 6711553), hereinafter referred to as Deng.

As per claim 1 and 26, Yaegashi teaches a method of controlling distribution of a segment of encrypted electronic information, comprising:

receiving, from a key server, a protected decryption key associated with the segment (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 51 – 53);

retrieving, at a user location, the segment (Yaegashi: see for example, Figure 3 Element S8 & S17 and Column 12 Line 14 – 17);

obtaining an unprotected copy of the decryption key from the protected decryption key (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 56 – 58 and Figure 3 S15);

Art Unit: 2131

decrypting, in response to said obtaining, the segment using the unprotected copy of the decryption key (Yaegashi: see for example, Figure 3 Element S8 & S17 and Column 12 Line 14 – 17);

Yaegashi further teaches a key expiration mechanism (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 22 – 26).

Yaegashi does not disclose expressly destroying the unprotected copy of the decryption key at the user location in response to said decrypting.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify (or to set / configure) the “elapsed time since the last use of the key” with the value of “zero” to accommodate “destroying the key immediately” because this enhances the security assuming the security concern overweighs the cost of additional processing time required when the key is needed again.

Yaegashi does not disclose expressly displaying the decrypted segment in response to said decrypting; and destroying the decrypted segment in response to said displaying.

Deng teaches displaying the decrypted segment in response to said decrypting; and destroying the decrypted segment in response to said displaying (Deng: see for example, Abstract Last Sentence and Column 11 Line 48 – 50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Deng within the system of Yaegashi because Deng teaches electronic copy protection of digital

Art Unit: 2131

documents against unauthorized copying and access to enhance the security (Deng: see for example, Column 1 Line 6 – 8).

As per claim 3, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Yaegashi as modified further teaches said receiving further comprising receiving at least one access policy associated with at least one of the key server, the user location, the segment, the decryption key, and a user, the at least one access policy including at least one fixed time limitation; said determining comprising determining whether current operating conditions, including the current time, satisfy the at least one access policy. (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 20 – 28).

As per claim 25, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 24). Yaegashi does not disclose expressly preventing the source from storing the copy of the decryption key, wherein said destroying leaves said segment permanently inaccessible absent breaking of the encryption protecting of the segment.

Deng teaches preventing the source from storing the copy of the decryption key, wherein said destroying leaves said segment permanently inaccessible absent breaking of the encryption protecting of the segment (Deng: see for example, Abstract Last Sentence and Column 11 Line 48 – 50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Deng within the system

Art Unit: 2131

of Yaegashi because Deng teaches electronic copy protection of digital documents against unauthorized copying and access to enhance the security (Deng: see for example, Column 1 Line 6 – 8).

11. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: US 6499106 B1), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi, in view of Jevans (Publication Number: US 2001/0055396 A1), hereinafter referred to as Jevans.

As per claim 6, Yaegashi teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 5). Yaegashi does not disclose expressly adding access policies associated with the information to the voucher.

Jevans teaches adding access policies associated with the information to the voucher (Jevans: see for example, Paragraph [0020] Line 7 – 10: the digital signature must be verified first, for example).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Jevans within the system of Yaegash because the communication efficiency can be improved by implementing the concatenation on a list of decryption keys associated with a list of requested segments within the same packet by reducing the number of exchanged messages between the server and the client.

Art Unit: 2131

12. Claims 8, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: 6499106), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi, in view of Davis (Patent Number: 6064736), hereinafter referred to as Davis.

As per claim 12, Yaegashi teaches a method of controlling distribution of electronic information, comprising:

sending, from a user location to a key server, a request to access a protected segment, and a first information (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 51 – 53 and Column 12 Line 29 – 32: one part of the first information sent by the client is the remote location ID as the public key);

Yaegashi does not teach receiving, at the user location from the key server, an encrypted voucher and a second information.

Davis teaches:

receiving, at the user location from the key server, an encrypted voucher and a second information, said voucher including at least a decryption key associated with the segment (Davis: see for example, Column 3 Line 49 – 51: The key is encrypted using DES with the client and server random numbers. The second information is interpreted as the sever random number);

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Davis within the system of Yaegashi because Davis teaches two-party authentication and verification by

Art Unit: 2131

using SecretHash which is the client and server random numbers to enhance security (Davis: see for example, Column 3 Line 35 and Column 3 Line 49 – 51).

Yaegashi as modified further teaches:

retrieving, at a user location, the segment (Yaegashi: see for example, Figure 3 Element S8 & S17 and Column 12 Line 14 – 17);

obtaining a decrypted copy of the decryption key using the first and second information (Davis: see for example, Column 3 Line 35 and Column 3 Line 49 – 51);

accessing, in response to said decrypting, the segment using the at least a portion of the voucher (Yaegashi: see for example, Figure 3 Element S8 & S17 and Column 12 Line 14 – 17);

Yaegashi further teaches a key expiration mechanism (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 22 – 26).

Yaegashi does not disclose expressly destroying, in response to said accessing, the decrypted copy of the decryption key.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify (or to set / configure) the “elapsed time since the last use of the key” with the value of “zero” to accommodate “destroying the key immediately” because this enhances the security assuming the security concern outweighs the cost of additional processing time required when the key is needed again.

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 8, claim 8 does not further teach over claim 12. Therefore, see same rationale addressed above in rejecting claim 12.

As per claim 14, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 12). Yaegashi as modified further teaches determining, in response to said decrypting, whether operating parameters satisfy the access policies; and said accessing being responsive to said operating parameters being determined to satisfy the access policies; wherein said accessing is responsive to said decrypting through said determining (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 28 – 50).

13. Claims 10 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: US 6499106 B1), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi and in view of Chen (Patent Number: 5822524), hereinafter referred to as Chen.

As per claim 10, Yaegashi teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 5). Yaegashi does not teach logging said obtaining in a log; and sending, from the user location to a remote server, the log.

Chen teaches:

logging said obtaining in a log; and sending, from the user location to a remote server, the log (Chen: see for example, Column 11 Line 21 – 23).

Art Unit: 2131

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chen within the system of Yaegashi as modified because Chen teaches methods for retrieval of multimedia files over distributed systems and networks (Chen: see for example, Column 1 Line 9 – 10).

As per claim 11, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 10). Yaegashi as modified further teaches comprising logging a time of said obtaining in the log (Chen: see for example, Column 11 Line 21 – 23).

14. Claims 17 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: 6499106), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi, in view of Okamoto (Patent Number: 6732106), hereinafter referred to as Okamoto.

As per claim 17, Yaegashi teaches a method of accessing a protected segment of electronic information, the segment having an associated key, comprising:

retrieving, at the user location, the segment (Yaegashi: see for example, Figure 3 Element S8 & S17 and Column 12 Line 14 – 17);

receiving, at the user location from the remote server, the key (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 51 – 53);

Art Unit: 2131

accessing the segment, in response to said receiving, using the key (Yaegashi: see for example, Figure 3 Element S8 & S17 and Column 12 Line 14 – 17);

displaying the segment as accessed (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 6 Line 15);

destroying the key in response to one of said displaying and said accessing, wherein the key is never stored in memory at a user location between said receiving and said destroying (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 22 – 26: Setting the “elapsed time since the last use of the key” with respect to the key expiration time to be “zero” would destroy the key immediately – See same rationale addressed above in rejecting claim 1);

receiving, at the user location from the remote server, an encrypted key lease including the key (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 51 – 53);

Yaegashi does not disclose expressly saving the encrypted key lease in a memory (Okamoto: see for example, Column 3 Line 55 – 58).

Okamoto teaches saving the encrypted key lease in a memory (Okamoto: see for example, Column 3 Line 55 – 58).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Okamoto within the system of Yaegashi because Okamoto provides a method of secure passing of sensitive data between the distribution server and the user device.

Art Unit: 2131

breaking a connection between the user location and the remote server
(Yaegashi: see for example, Figure 2 Element 102 and Column 10 Line 15 – 18:
this is an inherent function from dial-up modems) and
during a period of the broken connection:
retrieving, at the user location, the segment (Yaegashi: see for example,
Figure 3 Element S8 & S17 and Column 12 Line 14 – 17).
obtaining a decrypted copy of the key from the key lease (Yaegashi: see
for example, Column 12 Line 14 – 17);
accessing the segment in response to said obtaining (Yaegashi: see for
example, Column 12 Line 14 – 17);
displaying the segment as accessed (Yaegashi: see for example, Column
6 Line 15); and
destroying the decrypted copy of the key in response to one of said
displaying and said accessing (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 22 –
26: Setting the “elapsed time since the last use of the key” with respect to the key
expiration time to be “zero” would destroy the key immediately – See same
rationale addressed above in rejecting claim 1).

As per claim 18, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as
described above (see claim 17). Yaegashi as modified further teaches restoring
a connection between the user location and the remote server (Yaegashi: see for
example, Figure 2 Element 102 and Column 10 Line 15 – 18: this is an inherent
function from dial-up modems).

As per claim 19, Yaegashias modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 18). Yaegashias further teaches revoking the key lease after said restoring (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 25: Yaegashi teaches, under the policy of key expiration security mechanism, the key should be immediately expired as soon as an invalid attempt to access stored keys is detected).

15. Claims 2, 4, 15, 16, 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: 6499106), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi, in view of Deng (Patent Number: 6711553), hereinafter referred to as Deng and in view of Okamoto (Patent Number: 6732106), hereinafter referred to as Okamoto.

As per claim 2 and 27, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1 and 26). Yaegashi as modified does not disclose expressly in response to said receiving, the protected decryption key; wherein said destroying the unprotected copy of the decryption key does not effect the unprotected copy of the decryption key.

Okamoto further teaches saving, in response to said receiving, the protected decryption key; wherein said destroying the unprotected copy of the decryption key does not effect the unprotected copy of the decryption key (Okamoto: see for example, Column 3 Line 55 – 58).

Art Unit: 2131

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Okamoto within the system of Yaegashi because Okamoto teaches storing the encrypted decryption key in the secure data area to increase the security protection (Okamoto: see for example, Column 3 Line 43 – 58).

As per claim 4, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Yaegashi as modified does not teach further teaches saving, in response to said receiving, the protected decryption key in memory.

Okamoto teaches saving, in response to said receiving, the protected decryption key in memory (Okamoto: see for example, Column 3 Line 55 – 58).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Okamoto within the system of Yaegashi because Okamoto teaches storing the encrypted decryption key in the secure data area to increase the security protection (Okamoto: see for example, Column 3 Line 43 – 58).

Yaegashi as modified further teaches:

rendering the protected copy of the decryption key inaccessible after an expiration time in the at least one access policy (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 20 – 28).

Art Unit: 2131

As per claim 15 and 16, claim 15 and 16 do not further teach over claim 1 and claim 2. Therefore, see same rationale addressed above in rejecting claim 1 and claim 2.

As per claim 22, claim 22 does not further teach over claim 1, claim 2 and claim 3. Therefore, see same rationale addressed above in rejecting claim 1, claim 2 and claim 3.

16. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: 6499106), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi, in view of Davis (Patent Number: 6064736), hereinafter referred to as Davis, and in view of Deng (Patent Number: 6711553), hereinafter referred to as Deng.

As per claim 13, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 12). Yaegashi as modified does not disclose expressly displaying the accessed segment in response to said accessing; and destroying the accessed segment in response to said displaying.

Deng teaches displaying the accessed segment in response to said accessing; and destroying the accessed segment in response to said displaying (Deng: see for example, Abstract Last Sentence and Column 11 Line 48 – 50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Deng within the system of Yaegashi because Deng teaches electronic copy protection of digital

Art Unit: 2131

documents against unauthorized copying and access to enhance the security (Deng: see for example, Column 1 Line 6 – 8).

17. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: US 6499106 B1), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi, in view of Okamoto (Patent Number: 6732106), hereinafter referred to as Okamoto and in view of Chen (Patent Number: 5822524), hereinafter referred to as Chen.

As per claim 20, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 18). Yaegashi as modified does not teach logging said obtaining in a log; and sending, after said restoring, the log from the user location to the remote server.

Chen teaches:

logging said obtaining in a log; and sending, after said restoring, the log from the user location to the remote server.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chen within the system of Yaegashi as modified because Chen teaches methods for retrieval of multimedia files over distributed systems and networks (Chen: see for example, Column 1 Line 9 – 10).

As per claim 21, Yaegashi as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Yaegashi as modified further teaches detecting, at one of the user location and the remote server, from the contents of the log, any tampering at the user location relating to at least one of the key lease, the segment, and operating conditions at the user location (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 25: Yaegashi teaches any tampering at the user location relating to at least one of the key lease should be detected because, under the policy of key expiration security mechanism, the key must be immediately expired as soon as an invalid attempt to access stored keys is detected).

18. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaegashi (Patent Number: US 6499106 B1), hereinafter referred to as Yaegashi, in view of Jevans (Publication Number: US 2001/0055396 A1), hereinafter referred to as Jevans, and in view of Deng (Patent Number: 6711553), hereinafter referred to as Deng.

As per claim 23, Yaegashi teaches a method of controlling distribution of a segment of encrypted electronic information, the segment having a first and second portion, the method comprising:

receiving, from a key server, an encrypted voucher, the voucher including first and second decryption keys associated with the first and second portions, respectively (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 50 – 55: Yaegashi

Art Unit: 2131

teaches receiving, from a key server, an encrypted voucher. But, Yaegashi does not teach the voucher including first and second decryption keys associated with the first and second portions, respectively.

Jevans teaches the voucher including first and second decryption keys associated with the first and second portions, respectively (Jevans: see for example, Paragraph [0021] Line 9 – 12 and Paragraph [0024]: Jevans teaches the encrypted decryption keys could be bundled into the message without compromising the security of the mechanism).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Jevans within the system of Yaegash because the communication efficiency can be improved by implementing the concatenation on a list of decryption keys associated with a list of requested segments within the same packet by reducing the number of exchanged messages between the server and the client.

Yaegash as modified further teaches:

retrieving, at a user location, the segment (Yaegashi: see for example, Figure 3 Element S8 & S17 and Column 12 Line 14 – 17);

accessing the protected copy of the first decryption key (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 29 – 56);

decrypting, in response to said accessing, the first portion of the segment using the accessed copy of the first decryption key (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 29 – 56);

Art Unit: 2131

destroying the accessed copy of the first decryption key at the user location in response to said decrypting (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 22 – 26: Setting the “elapsed time since the last use of the key” with respect to the key expiration time to be “zero” would destroy the key immediately – See same rationale addressed above in rejecting claim 1);

displaying the decrypted segment in response to one of said decrypting and said destroying (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 6 Line 15: the purpose of invention);

Yaegashi as modified does not disclose expressly destroying the decrypted first portion in response to said displaying.

Deng teaches destroying the decrypted first portion in response to said displaying (Deng: see for example, Abstract Last Sentence and Column 11 Line 48 – 50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Deng within the system of Yaegashi because Deng teaches electronic copy protection of digital documents against unauthorized copying and access to enhance the security (Deng: see for example, Column 1 Line 6 – 8).

accessing the protected copy of the second decryption key after said destroying the first decrypted segment (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 29 – 56) and (Jevans: see for example, Paragraph [0021] Line 9 – 12 and Paragraph [0024]; and

Art Unit: 2131

decrypting, in response to said accessing the protected copy of the second decryption key, the second portion of the segment using the accessed copy of the second decryption key (Yaegashi: see for example, Column 12 Line 29 – 56).

Art Unit: 2131

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

LBC

Ch. Chai
ELIZABETH L. CHAI
PATENT EXAMINER